



Olney Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of representations received at Regulation 16 consultation (publicity of a submitted neighbourhood plan)

Respondent	Summary of representation
Alan Smith	<p>Request that the Council adopts area of land and fields field extending to the river through which are various footpaths the principal of which is that which leads to the foot bridge known as “the planks” so that the footpaths and bridges can be maintained to a standard which would allow wheel chair users access to this area. Nature reserves could also be designated within this area.</p> <p>A route should be designated and protected for the rail line to protect the opportunity of the line opening again in future. a station could be at site ‘R’, and since planning permission for a store was not granted there is an excellent opportunity to protect this site. The line would have consequences for sites ‘B’ and ‘C’ but these would be minimal and outweighed by the benefits such a line.</p> <p>This concept of neighbourhood planning is flawed as it does not indicate a regional or national concept with in which future developments will benefit the town. The Council should liaise with neighbouring County and Town Councils and any relevant Government Department or Agency and Network Rail to define and protect a route for the future. It may also help with future pressures created by the expressway and housing growth.</p> <p>The line would also improve social mobility for those unable to afford a private car, and wider mobility benefits for the residents of Olney</p>
Alison Stringfellow	<p>Object to allocations of site D and E on the basis that good quality agricultural land is to be used for development when there are brownfield sites elsewhere in the rural area of the borough (Newport Pagnell) which should be developed first.</p> <p>Object to ONP4 for Site E as there is no recognition of impact on amenity of nearby residential properties; impact on wildlife; should be 15m buffer to properties in Aspreys; increased risk of crime and disturbance; possible increase in flood risk caused by development of the site</p>

Anglian Water
Services Ltd

POLICY ONP3 – SITE A and POLICY ONP5 –
SAFEGUARDED SITE F

There are existing Anglian Water assets within the boundary of sites A and F which should be taken into account in the site layout, protected by easements, not be built over or located in private gardens. Sewers or mains should be located in highways or public open space. Diversion may be possible under the Water Industry Act 1991.

It is therefore proposed that the following text be included in relation to the above sites.

(Site A): Foul and surface water sewers cross this site, therefore the site layout should be designed to take this into account.

(Site F): A water main crosses this site, therefore the site layout should be designed to take this into account.

ONP14 Site R

Habitable buildings should be located a minimum of 15 metres from the boundary of Pumping Stations in accordance with the current version of Sewers for Adoption.

There are existing foul sewers which cross the site. Propose that the following text should be included. "Foul sewers crosses this site, therefore the site layout should be designed to take this into account."

The site is also within close proximity to Olney Water Recycling Centre. Where it is proposed to develop sites within proximity of the water recycling centres there is a need to consider further the odour impact and the extent to which retail development could be accommodated on the site without having an adverse impact on future occupants.

It is therefore suggested that the following additional text be added to the wording of Policy ONP14.

"a detailed Odour Assessment to demonstrate that the site can be developed without having an adverse impact on future occupants of any regularly occupied land and buildings arising from the proximity of the site to Olney Water Recycling Centre."

POLICY ONP10 – HEALTH

Proposed that that the text in final paragraph is replaced with the following text:

"Consider the proximity of the foul pumping station in the design and layout of the scheme, and allow for a distance of 15 metres from the boundary of the pumping station to the

	<p>buildings to reduce the risk of nuisance/loss of amenity associated with the operation of the pumping station.”</p> <p>POLICY ONP12 and ONP13 – Sites S, B and C</p> <p>These sites are located within close proximity to Olney Water Recycling Centre. Nuisance may be caused by noise, lighting and traffic movements but its most prevalent source will be odours, unavoidably generated by the treatment of sewerage. Where it is proposed to develop sites within proximity of the water recycling centres there is a need to consider further the odour impact and the extent to which employment development could be accommodated on the site without having an adverse impact on future occupants.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that the following additional text be added to the wording of Policy ONP12 and ONP13.</p> <p>“a detailed Odour Assessment to demonstrate that the site can be developed without having an adverse impact on future occupants of any regularly occupied land and buildings arising from the proximity of the site to Olney Water Recycling Centre.”</p>
Anthony Bush	<p>Object as proposed site allocations would encroach or impede the reasonable course of railway reopening or recovery of route of former Bedford – Olney – Northampton railway and the Handley Alignment. Reopening the railway would be of benefit to Olney, Milton Keynes and Bedford in terms of reducing traffic, parking and air pollution, and allowing more West Coast Mainline Services for Milton Keynes</p>
Brian Wilson	<p>New housing sites should include convenience shops for the benefit of new and existing housing around Aspreys.</p> <p>A road or new footpath opposite foxhills should be incorporated</p> <p>A 3 hour time limit on parking on the High Street should be imposed, along with permit parking for residents of the High Street. This would prevent commuter parking behaviours which reduce available parking throughout the day.</p>
Buckinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	<p>No comment</p>
Christopher Dewhurst	<p>Object as proposed site allocations would encroach or impede the reasonable course of railway reopening or recovery of route of former Bedford – Olney – Northampton railway and the Handley Alignment. Reopening the railway would be of benefit to Olney, Milton Keynes and Bedford in terms of reducing traffic, parking and air pollution, and allowing more West Coast Mainline Services for Milton Keynes</p>
Councillor Alan Webb	<p>Object as proposed site allocations would encroach or impede the reasonable course of railway reopening or recovery of route of former Bedford – Olney – Northampton railway and the Handley Alignment. Reopening the railway would be of</p>

	benefit to Olney, Milton Keynes and Bedford in terms of reducing traffic, parking and air pollution, and allowing more West Coast Mainline Services for Milton Keynes
Councillor Phil Larrat	Object as proposed site allocations would encroach or impede the reasonable course of railway reopening or recovery of route of former Bedford – Olney – Northampton railway and the Handley Alignment. Reopening the railway would be of benefit to Olney, Milton Keynes and Bedford in terms of reducing traffic, parking and air pollution, and allowing more West Coast Mainline Services for Milton Keynes
Emberton Parish Council	The incorrect proposals map for the A509 Olney Bypass (page 10) has been used in the formulation of the Olney Neighbourhood Plan.
Richard Pill, Simon Barber, David Ferguson English Regional Transport Association	Object as proposed site allocations would encroach or impede the reasonable course of railway reopening or recovery of route of former Bedford – Olney – Northampton railway and the Handley Alignment. Reopening the railway would be of benefit to Olney, Milton Keynes and Bedford in terms of reducing traffic, parking and air pollution, and allowing more West Coast Mainline Services for Milton Keynes
Paul Johnson, Francis Jackson Homes	<p>Policy ONP2 – support the inclusion of Site A for residential development as identified on the proposals map.</p> <p>Policy ONP3 –General thrust of this policy is supported, however, we make the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Propose that the density reference of Policy ONP3 should be removed for the avoidance of any internal conflict within the policy or other ambiguity. Also, such a high density would fail to have regard to the edge of settlement location, site constraints and sensitive transition to open countryside as will be required. 2. Regarding parking standards, whilst the guidance of the MKC Parking Standards SPD is referred to, this should not be the main determinative guidance on this matter – especially in the context of this site as a development on the edge of a rural town, not a Milton Keynes grid square, where the requirements and location of such parking (most critically), and the contextual appropriateness of significant on-street visitor parking areas is either not justified nor contextually appropriate. Some contextual reference to the appropriateness would make this less Milton Keynes town prescriptive and more Olney-centric. 3. Regarding open space aspirations, the provisions are not in accord with higher tier adopted MKC policy on the nature, scale or type of play areas that can be sought on developments of this scale. They should therefore be reviewed or omitted. Planning permission reference 16/00688/OUT for Site A and the associated S106 agreement provided for off-site S106 contributions towards Playing Fields, Local Play, Neighbourhood Play and both Local and District Parks. MKC Officers advised that MKC policy was

	<p>moving away from the provision of smaller areas of equipped open space on site given the challenges of maintenance of an excessive numbers of such smaller areas rendering their viability and quality questionable. The current objective of ONP3 is contrary to that stance. We ask this to be reviewed with MKC Officers as it could lead to significant ambiguity and is not in accordance with higher tier policy guidance as established through 16/00688/OUT.</p> <p>4. No objection to SuDS requirements, however it stipulates the requirement for this to include balancing ponds, swales and other measures. Swales and a balancing pond may not be suitable or possible to be incorporated on this site. This would be identified as part of the FRA and Sustainable Urban Drainage Strategy. The policy does not need to be so prescriptive. We request a minor revision to the policy accordingly.</p>
Geoffrey Reading	<p>Object as proposed site allocations would encroach or impede the reasonable course of railway reopening or recovery of route of former Bedford – Olney – Northampton railway and the Handley Alignment. Reopening the railway would be of benefit to Olney, Milton Keynes and Bedford in terms of reducing traffic, parking and air pollution, and allowing more West Coast Mainline Services for Milton Keynes</p>
Gladman	<p>Outlined legislation, national planning policy and guidance relating Neighbourhood Planning, and how the Olney NP relates to the Milton Keynes Core Strategy and the emerging PlanMK</p> <p>Suggest that several policies will need modifying to meet basic conditions test.</p> <p>ONP1 – housing target should be seen as a minimum, not a maximum to accord with the NPPF requirements.</p> <p>ONP2 – Object to defining a settlement boundary and the land beyond as Open Countryside where development would be refused. This precludes possible sustainable development from happening. Question setting settlement boundaries now when they will be reviewed by PlanMK</p> <p>ONP7 – Should not be restricted by local connection as it conflicts with the Milton Keynes policy that affordable housing is to meet the borough’s needs.</p> <p>ONP15 – does not read as a policy, just an aspiration, and does not guide the decision maker.</p> <p>ONP17 - does not read as a policy, just an aspiration, and does not guide the decision maker. It is a restrictive policy which does not accord with basic conditions</p>
Historic England	<p>Policies ONP3 and ONP4: The requirements for archaeological assessment do not conform to the methodology for conserving heritage assets in a manner</p>

	<p>according to their significance set out in the NPPF. Sites A, D and E are all considered to have, at least, some potential for the presence of archaeological remains. We do not consider that the type of development proposed would in any case merit the loss of remains of undesignated national importance should any be present. An archaeological assessment would not help to understand implications for development of the presence of previously unidentified remains that can only be identified through more thorough survey techniques – including geophysical survey or excavation and, as such, development proposals could accidentally fail to comply with this policy. We recommend using an alternative text for the bullet point regarding archaeological remains in each policy.</p> <p>Policy ONP13 and ONP14 The supporting text for both policies identifies the proximity of the scheduled ancient monument and the likelihood of encountering archaeological remains of national importance as an issue for their development. Both policies include an element requiring an archaeological assessment to be completed demonstrating that a proposed development would not harm archaeological remains. This approach does not conform with the methodology set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Given the identified potential for remains of high importance to be present it is likely that development of either site will involve some loss of archaeological remains. The policy at present would therefore present the development envisaged. We recommend a replacement text for Policy ONP 13 bullet point h) and Policy ONP 14 bullet point 1 respectively.</p>
Indigo Planning	<p>Welcome the allocation of Site R for a foodstore, but suggest that the allocation also include housing or mixed use as there is no longer any market demand for a large foodstore or petrol filling station, whilst there is a need to provide housing.</p> <p>ONP14 does not accord with the CIL regulations. Planning obligations should only sought where they are directly relate to the development, are reasonable in kind and scale, and would be required to make development acceptable.</p>
J Woolmer	<p>Object as proposed site allocations would encroach or impede the reasonable course of railway reopening or recovery of route of former Bedford – Olney – Northampton railway and the Handley Alignment. Reopening the railway would be of benefit to Olney, Milton Keynes and Bedford in terms of reducing traffic, parking and air pollution, and allowing more West Coast Mainline Services for Milton Keynes</p>
Town Planning Services obo JC Gill Developments	<p>ONP12 is unsound, unjustified and does not meet the basic conditions as it is inconsistent with the NPPF in that it continues to allocate a parcel of land for employment purposes when there is no reasonable prospect of such uses coming forward; and in that it is inflexible to other possible uses contrary to the NPPF. Suggest that the part of site covered by an outline permission for residential development be removed from the proposed employment allocation.</p>

Hextall Twiddy obo Kitchener Family	<p>General support for the Plan. Willing to provide land for any further commercial development needed to the north of the town subject to there being sufficient highway capacity.</p> <p>Willing to provide land for the western bypass option, as this would be more favourable to the eastern bypass option.</p>
Natural England	<p>Note some inconsistencies within the Strategic Environmental Assessment. Chapter 3.2 Biodiversity covers the requirement for biodiversity net gains to be delivered by new planning instruments including those set out by Milton Keynes Council Local Plan Core Strategy.</p> <p>Chapter 8 states; <i>“8.2.2 None of the preferred sites comprise Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat, but one site (Site A, north east of Olney) is designated as a Wildlife Corridor. Development of this site should therefore seek to ensure that the biodiversity asset is protected. This could be achieved by maintaining a continuous and well-connected and multifunctional green space”</i>.</p> <p>However Policy ONP3 – Site A, has no such requirement for protection of the wildlife corridor or in fact a requirement for a biodiversity net gain as part of any development. It is unclear what the SEA has based its assessment on.</p> <p>Policies ONP5, ONP6 and ONP 14 also propose development without requiring a biodiversity net gain. Regardless of whether a site contains Priority Habitat, biodiversity is required to be conserved by the NPPF section 109 and under 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (further information is provided in Annex 1). The SEA states that biodiversity net gain is a requirement and yet this is not translated in the Plan. The policies currently outlined in the Plan have the potential to cause impacts to biodiversity in the Olney Parish. This has not been assessed by the SEA. The SEA document is written almost like a SPD to indicate what should happen in terms of Biodiversity net gain. It does not assess the Plan’s ability to deliver biodiversity net gain as it is currently written.</p>
CC Town Planning obo Newton Homes	<p>Our client has positively sought to engage with Olney Town Council on the production of the neighbourhood plan and with regard to Site B.</p> <p>We are satisfied that the plan meets the Basic Conditions and is compliant with the applicable legislation. The SEA is considered to take the correct approach and our client agrees with its conclusions on the plan overall and with regards to the significant positive contributions of Site B.</p>
Peter Solomon	<p>Reopening of the Bedford to Northampton railway line would have benefits for Olney and Milton Keynes, and the wider area by creating direct links from Cambridge to Birmingham. Provision should be made for the reopening of the Bedford to Northampton railway line in the plan by preserving a viable rail route through the town. This is not the case due to proposed</p>

	<p>site allocations. In the meantime, preserving such a route could provide some attractive green space / walking paths etc, while leaving ample space still for development.</p>
<p>Providence Land obo landowners of Sites D and E</p>	<p>The submitted Plan complies with the required basic conditions, is in general conformity with the strategic development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, will contribute to sustainable development by setting out a positive planning framework for the locality. The Steering Group has sought to ensure housing growth and infrastructure including community facilities are provided in a coordinated manner, which Providence Land is very willing to facilitate through the phased development of Sites D and E.</p> <p>We support Policy OPN4 and all its elements. Providence Land can confirm that the proposed policy requirements for Sites D and E are considered to be deliverable.</p> <p>Our only suggested change to the Neighbourhood Plan is to show the remainder of Site E on the Proposals Map as a Strategic Reserve site and to enshrine this more firmly in policy to match that of the Site F Strategic Reserve site (Policy ONP5). We suggest it should be included within the new Settlement Boundary and Safeguarded as a 'Reserved Housing' site. The remainder of Site E is considered to be a more suitable and logical site for a Strategic Reserve than Site F, as it would follow directly on from the Site E housing allocation as part of the same parcel of land bounded by the same field boundaries and within the same ownership. David Lock Associates is currently masterplanning both sites and have allowed for the remainder of Site E to be easily integrated into their masterplan framework. There are several aspects of the masterplan that would support the remainder of Site E following on from the housing site allocated by Policy ONP4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site E is very well located in relation to the town centre and the proposed accessibility improvements along Yardley Road to be delivered by the forthcoming planning application. - The remainder of Site E sits alongside the proposed strategic open space allocation within Site D and could form a direct pedestrian link as well as extending the Green Infrastructure into Site E. - The remainder of Site E connects the proposed housing allocation within Site E to the Public Right of Way running along the outer edge of Site E and can deliver a high quality pedestrian/cycle route between the two. - The proposed housing allocation within Site E is able to deliver an off-site high quality pedestrian cycle/route to the nearby Ousedale Secondary School, which will benefit development within the remainder of Site E. - The proposed housing allocation within Site E is able to

	<p>deliver an off-site 30m wide structural planting corridor along the outer edge of the whole of Site D and E, thereby putting in place the permanent visual mitigation for the remainder of Site E.</p>
Newport Pagnell Town Council	<p>Support the Olney Neighbourhood Plan</p>
Peter Brett Associates obo Rockspring Barwood Olney Ltd	<p>Welcome the identification of Site F in the ONP as a 'safeguarded' strategic reserve housing site under Policy ONP5, however we have a number of concerns with its current inflexible wording.</p> <p>ONP5 only allows Site F to come forward if all other residential allocations (Sites A, D and E) fail to deliver the target of 300 dwellings by the end the plan period (2031).</p> <p>Consider that the rigid wording of Policy ONP5 is risk delivery of development within the plan, is not responsive to likely future changes, risks failing to meet two of the basic conditions (having regard to national planning policy and guidance and being in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan).</p> <p>Flexibility is essential in light of the uncertainty around future changes which may impact on development proposed in the ONP, including changes to emerging PlanMK, five year housing land supply position, the Housing White Paper, investment initiatives, and a possible Judicial Review of the Gavin Barwell WMS on Neighbourhood Plan and five year land supply (para 49 NPPF).</p> <p>Should any or all these outcomes come to fruition, it will place additional pressure for the Borough's housing requirements to be increased, including a proportional increase in the level of development required at the key settlements including Olney. Policy ONP5 is not flexible enough to adapt to any upward revision of the overall housing requirement and will fall foul of the basic condition of being in general conformity with the strategic development plan for the Borough, as illustrated in a recent examination of the Weedon Bec Neighbourhood Plan, and other recent examinations.</p> <p>On this basis, we recommend that more flexible wording for ONP5 needs to be introduced. In particular, we suggest that a mechanism is introduced whereby Site F should come forward within the plan period where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any of sites A, D or E do not deliver housing in an appropriate timescale based on bi-annual monitoring of their progress towards delivery; or - If monitoring of the neighbourhood plans for the other key settlements demonstrates that they will fail to deliver their housing allocations within an appropriate timescale; or - The overall housing requirement for Plan:MK is increased through the plan-making process.

Tim Page	Object as proposed site allocations would encroach or impede the reasonable course of railway reopening or recovery of route of former Bedford – Olney – Northampton railway and the Handley Alignment. Reopening the railway would be of benefit to Olney, Milton Keynes and Bedford in terms of reducing traffic, parking and air pollution, and allowing more West Coast Mainline Services for Milton Keynes
Lindsay Filbee	<p>Site A was originally proposed to be a place where bungalows would be built for the elderly and for affordable houses.</p> <p>However, it was added that this would be subject to the landowner's permission. Of course the landowners have not approved that type of housing on Site A – thus making the residents of Olney's votes futile.</p> <p>A proposal for 50 houses of various types (mostly 3 and 4 beds) was objected to by residents and Olney Town Council as the field is likely to flood and the build will have an adverse affect on existing housing around in Cowper Street and Midland Road. The first proposal was rejected. A second proposal followed in 2016 and was again rejected. We were told that it would be decided by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>However, in August 2016 MK Council held a meeting which included discussion of this site. All previous arguments for rejecting Site A as suitable for building houses were dismissed and planning was approved.</p> <p>Residents in Cowper Street and Midland Road are dismayed that houses will be built on fields so close to a river and flood plains and are concerned at how flooding will increase. We are also concerned for the wildlife and nature.</p> <p>The Olney Neighbourhood Plan is being pushed by a Councillor whose son works for Francis Jackson – and it is Francis Jackson who plan to build the 50 houses on Site A. People of Olney will not be getting what they thought they voted for and current residents and wildlife around Site A will be adversely affected.</p>
Leonard Lean	<p>Outlined the planning history of Site A, and the historic and current level of bus services operating from Olney to Milton Keynes and other service centres, expressing the view that these are not sufficient or likely to be maintained going forward due to funding cuts.</p> <p>Outlined the history of the railway line between Northampton – Olney – Bedford and the wider strategic rail and road context, including the demand placed upon strategic roads from freight arriving into the UK and being distributed across the country.</p> <p>Suggested that these considerations justify reopening of the Northampton – Olney – Bedford railway line, a new station, and for not allowing development of site in Olney (via the Olney Neighbourhood Plan) which would prejudice the reopening. Outlined how this might be achieved in terms of</p>

	infrastructure (such as a new viaduct) services to and from these towns and onward to London, and that the impacts of reopening (traffic/congestion impacts from level crossings, noise) would be outweighed by the benefits provided by improved rail travel opportunities for residents of Olney and the wider area.
--	--